

B07
4168
F7

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



Alcuin Club
Prayer Book Revision Pamphlets
VIII

THE PRIMITIVE DEDICATION PRAYER

*A Lecture given at the Annual
Meeting of the Club, June 7, 1922*

BY
W. H. FRERE, D.D.
Priest of the Community of the Resurrection

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LTD.
LONDON : 28 Margaret Street, Oxford Circus, W. 1
OXFORD : 9 High Street
MILWAUKEE, U.S.A. : The Morehouse Publishing Co.



Alcuin Club
Prayer Book Revision Pamphlets
VIII

THE PRIMITIVE CONSECRATION PRAYER

*A Lecture given at the Annual
Meeting of the Club, June 7, 1922*

BY
W. H. FRERE, D.D.
Priest of the Community of the Resurrection

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LTD.
LONDON : 28 Margaret Street, Oxford Circus, W. 1
OXFORD : 9 High Street
MILWAUKEE, U.S.A. : The Morehouse Publishing Co.

NOV 29 1956

CHIEF AUTHORITIES

- TURNER, C. H.—Two Articles in the *Church Quarterly Review*, October, 1917, and October, 1918, on the Hippolytean Church Order.
- D. A. C. L.—*Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*. Cabrol & Leclercq (in progress).
- CAGIN, DOM P.—*L'Anaphore Apostolique*. Paris, 1919.
- FUNK, F. X.—*Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*. Paderborn, 1905.
- COOPER & MACLEAN.—*The Testament of our Lord*. Edinburgh, 1902.
- HAULER, E.—*Didascaliae Apostolorum Fragmenta*. 1900.
- CONNOLLY, DOM R. H.—*The So-called Egyptian Church Order*. Cambridge, 1916.
- BRIGHTMAN, F. E.—*L. E. W., i.e. Liturgies Eastern and Western*. Oxford, 1896.
- HORNER, G.—*The Statutes of the Apostles*. London, 1904.
- ROBINSON, J. ARMITAGE.—*St. Irenæus, The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*. S.P.C.K., 1920.

THE PRIMITIVE CONSECRATION PRAYER

THERE seems to have arisen in the course of the Third Century a demand for something which might serve as a handbook and guide in the growing centres of Christian life. Such manuals¹ were naturally not of literary value, nor the work of great writers ; nor were they of very permanent value. The tide of life and development flowed on ; and after the Fourth Century the handbooks of this nature were for the most part out of date, and survived only in backwaters. To us, however, the remains of them are of great value and interest.

They were the work of compilers, using existing material, and working it up to suit the need of the moment. The most famous of these is the book called the *Apostolic Constitutions*. It was written in the second half of the Fourth Century by a compiler, apparently a man of Arian beliefs, who had a ready pen and was interested in serving up older literature in a new form, exhibiting considerable modifications and large amplifications made from his own point of view. The eight books of the *Apostolic Con-*

¹ The term "Church-Order" is avoided, as misleading.

stitutions have long been known to us ; but the nature and history of the compilation has only been brought out by more recent study. The first of the eight books is based on the *Didache*, the next six on the *Didascalia*, and the eighth on a previous compilation known in many forms now and by several names, at the basis of which is discernible a writing of Hippolytus, the "anti-pope" of Rome in the early years of the Third Century, known to have existed but not now extant in its original form.

Now, when seeking for the earliest Eucharistic liturgy, it was till lately not possible to go behind the form included in this eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. Consequently it acquired an abnormal importance. It was even named the "Clementine Liturgy," and treated as primitive. The further investigation of the *Apostolic Constitutions* has shown us the faultiness of this view, and has now perhaps led to an undue depreciation of the document. It is true that it is unorthodox ; also that it does not represent the use of any known Church, but is primarily a literary effort on the part of a writer who lived in Syria, and whose habitation was not far from Grub Street. But it has its intrinsic value even so. As a literary effort of the last quarter of the Fourth Century it is older than any extant liturgical service that was available until recently. Now, however, we are able to go behind it ; and fortune has recently placed in our hands a consecration prayer of a much

earlier date, to say nothing of the "Sacramentary" of Serapion, also recently discovered, which is a liturgical book of services dating from the middle of the Fourth Century.

Part of the work of Hippolytus which underlies the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the book in which the liturgy is included, comprises a treatise on ordinations; and this, at any rate in some of the forms in which it has been preserved to us in the handbooks of the Third and Fourth Centuries, includes an Eucharistic consecration prayer. It is included there as being the prayer which is to be said by the newly-made bishop, after his consecration to the episcopate. Handbooks of one kind or another, containing this prayer, have been preserved in Ethiopic, Greek, Syriac, and Latin: and the publication of these and consequent discussion upon them has greatly advanced our knowledge of the earliest consecration prayer. The Ethiopic form has not only survived in the Ethiopic translation of the Handbook, but it underlies the liturgy which is still in use in the Abyssinian Church. The Syriac form is in the handbook called *The Testament of our Lord*, first published in 1899. The Latin form is known to us from fragments of a palimpsest MS. at Verona which were issued by Hauler in 1900. It is this Latin form which you have in your hands.¹ Happily the palimpsest leaves have preserved this part of the handbook complete.

¹ See the table at the end (p. 23).

4 THE PRIMITIVE CONSECRATION PRAYER

I have numbered the clauses for convenience in referring to them: but the prayer is one continuous and complete consecration prayer.

It would be risky, I think, either to assert, or to deny that it formed part of the tract of Hippolytus which is the main document underlying these handbooks in their various forms. It may be argued that Hippolytus naturally included it in his Ordination Services. But it is the sort of addition that might easily be made by a compiler at a later stage: and when we observe that it is lacking in some of the many forms in which we have the handbook preserved to us, we are warned to be cautious.

It will be best therefore to take the document and examine it as it stands, and apart from the setting in which it has been preserved, where it might be either a composition of Hippolytus, or an earlier composition incorporated by him, or again a later addition made by a compiler after his time.

No one can look at it without seeing signs of great antiquity.

1. It includes no *Sanctus* in any form. At a later stage, when the Abyssinians wanted to have the *Sanctus* in their liturgy, they inserted it very awkwardly in the middle of line 21. The compiler of the *Testament* made many modifications in reproducing the prayer; but among them he made none to introduce the *Sanctus*. The compiler of the *Apostolic Constitutions* introduced it by an enormous preface, following directly upon line 7.

Now the introduction of the *Sanctus* into the liturgy is traditionally ascribed by the *Liber Pontificalis* to Pope Sixtus († 127). That ascription may have some value, or it may not. At any rate the earliest passage that I can quote as bearing upon the date of this addition is from the treatise of Irenæus, newly recovered in an Armenian version, called the *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*, c. 10.

“God is glorified by His Word, who is His Son continually, and by the Holy Spirit who is the Wisdom of the Father of all: and the power(s) of these, (namely) of the Word and Wisdom, which are called Cherubim and Seraphim, with unceasing voices glorify God, and every created thing that is in the heaven offers glory to God the Father of all.”

This passage seems to carry us beyond the point of a biblical citation from Isaiah or the Revelation, and to suggest acquaintance with the liturgical preface, and, by implication with the *Sanctus*.

2. Noteworthy, but less significant is the absence of the Lord's Prayer. Here there is nothing after the doxology in lines 58–61. We can watch the addition being made at later stages, both in the Abyssinian liturgy and in the *Testament*. But it has not been made in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, although by the date when that compilation was made, we know of its existence in this position both from St. Cyril of Jerusalem and St. Chrysostom.

6 THE PRIMITIVE CONSECRATION PRAYER

Thus we are encouraged to look more closely, and to ask what is the language of the original. Our best text is in Latin ; but it has all the appearance of a somewhat slavish translation. The Greek of the *Apostolic Constitutions* agrees very closely with the Latin in places. This suggests that parts of an original Greek text have been incorporated, though the compiler has evidently made large additions. The tract of Hippolytus was certainly in Greek : and if Hippolytus wrote the prayer, Greek would be the original : if he incorporated it, then it must have been either originally Greek or else translated for the purpose ; and the latter is the less likely of the two alternatives. Even if it was first introduced by the writer of the handbook, it was probably then in Greek, otherwise we could hardly account for its dissemination in the East.

A further indication points, though not conclusively, in the same direction. In line 13 the title familiar to us as "Wonderful Counsellor" from Isaiah vi. 9 appears as "the Angel of Thy Will." This phrase represents the Greek version, *μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος*, but not the Hebrew, nor the usual Latin version, which follows the Hebrew. This Greek interpretation was known in the Latin world. St. Cyprian¹ has *magnae cogitationis nuntius*, and Novatian² *magni consilii angelus* ; while the translator of Irenæus³ has

¹ *Testim.* ii. 21.

² *De Trin.* xviii, xxi, and xxviii.

³ *Hæres.* III. xvii. 3 ; xx. 2 ; IV. lv. 2 ; *Demonstr.* 56.

both *magni consilii nuntius*, and the familiar *admirabilis consiliarius* twice over.

This version of the text stands independently of those quoted. It is used here significantly, not as a mere title ; and serves as a description of our Lord in His relation to the Father. Irenæus elsewhere ¹ uses the phrase significantly, but in the other version, and interpreting it of Him as counsellor of the Father. Such a use is natural where the Latin version was the more familiar, while the other is more natural in a Greek-speaking area. The use of the phrase here is then not conclusive : but it adds perhaps a little to the presumption that the original of our document was Greek.

When we look at the versicles prefixed to the prayer the case is different. The opening salutation is probably taken from 2 Timothy iv. 22. There it is a simple greeting from the writer to the recipient : and it required 'some alteration to make it suitable for a mutual salutation between priest and people. In the Latin-speaking area this was done by the simple insertion of *vobiscum* : *et*. But in the Greek-speaking area either *μετὰ πάντων, καὶ* is inserted : or some more elaborate change is made. Here we find not the Greek but the Latin usage—*Dominus vobiscum*.

We next reach the *Sursum corda*. That versicle and response is surely Latin in origin. Not only is it first known to us from the

¹ *Demonstr.* 40, 55.

home of ecclesiastical Latin—the province of Africa, but the phrase itself is an essentially Latin one. *Sursum habere corda* is quite good Latin ; but none of the Greek equivalents are at all idiomatic Greek, and the versions in other languages seem to be no better.

It appears, then, that we have a Greek prayer, to which there have been prefixed the Latin versicles. Such a combination turns our thoughts to Rome of the early Third Century—the Rome of Hippolytus and Callistus, as the likeliest place to produce such a phenomenon.

How much further can we go in trying to trace the origin of the document from internal evidence ? There is a good deal in the way of style and language which may connect it with Hippolytus ; but there are other features that might point to the end of the Second Century rather than the beginning of the Third. Also some of the points of contact with Hippolytus are also points of contact with writers earlier than him, particularly with Irenæus ; and, behind him, with Justin. Besides, it is always likely when a phrase is common to a liturgical document and a patristic passage, that the latter is derived from the former, rather than the reverse : though the reverse may more easily happen during the early centuries than later on, because the liturgies then were less standardized, and the bishops were more free to frame their own formulas. Consequently where our prayer agrees with a phrase of Hippolytus, the bishop may be taken, either (i) to be influenced

by an already existing prayer, or else (ii) to be the author of the prayer, and to be using in it language or ideas which he also uses elsewhere. This is the ambiguity which besets us when we note the correspondence of our prayer with the writings of Hippolytus.¹ A crucial instance is the doxology. It is common to other liturgical formulas in the handbook, and closely allied to the doxology with which Hippolytus closes his *Contra haeresin Noeti*. In any case this fact argues strongly for the theory that this consecration prayer is part and parcel of the Hippolytean tract and not an addition made subsequently by a compiler. But it does not settle whether Hippolytus was the originator of the doxology in all the various places where it is found. It may be that he took it from an existing consecration prayer and utilized it here, and for all the other prayers in his tract, as well as in closing his treatise against Noetus.

Another marked parallel between Hippolytus and the prayer is to be found at line 20. This idea of the indication of Christ to be the Son of God is frequent in Hippolytus²: but does he derive it from the prayer, or does the prayer owe it to him? The same question arises with regard to the terse phrase immediately following in line 20, which Irenæus seems to avoid but Hippolytus

¹ Dom Connolly has collected most of the passages. See pp. 154, 165, 166.

² See not only *contra h. N.* c. 4, 11, 15, quoted by Connolly, but also cc. 12 and 14.

uses freely. Does he do so because he is familiar with it in his liturgy?

Some of the parallels, which are observable, must be carried behind Hippolytus to earlier writers: *e.g.* in line 14 *inseparabile*, ἀχώριστος, is not only Hippolytus' word in *contra N. c.* 18, but Justin's in *Dial.* 128. ii; and at line 24 the Hippolytean parallels are found also in Irenæus, in Justin, and in Barnabas.¹ Again in line 33 the like is the case.²

But the group of clauses 28–32 as a whole may well be thought to carry us back to earlier days than those of Hippolytus. It is the language and method of the Apologists and of Irenæus that appears here.³ Even the obscure phrase in line 32 which has puzzled the commentators may perhaps best be explained by a reference to Irenæus' phrase:—

Filius, Verbum dei existens, a Patre descendens, et incarnatus, et usque ad mortem descendens, et dispensationem consummans nostrae salutis.⁴

It is difficult therefore to draw a definite con-

¹ Irenæus, *Demonstr.* 46, 79; Justin, *Apol.* i. 35; Barnabas xii. 2, 4.

² Compare Hipp. *Philos.* x. 23 with Irenæus, *Demonstr.* 38, 39, 72 and Barn. v. 6.

³ *Hæres.* II. xxxii. 2. Et dominus quidem per passionem mortem destruxit et solvit errorem, corruptionemque exterminavit, et ignorantiam destruxit; vitam autem manifestavit, et ostendit veritatem, et incorruptionem donavit. Cp. *Demonstr.* 6, 37, 38.

⁴ *Hæres.* III. xix. 2.

clusion, except so far as to say that the Prayer is Hippolytean enough in character to be an integral part of the tract, and not a later addition. It may be that the prayer is older than Hippolytus and has influenced his thought and expression : or it may be that it is his composition : or, perhaps more probably than anything, we must see in this prayer Hippolytus' own consecration prayer modelled to a large extent on tradition that has come down to him.

The search for parallels has already provided suggestions which prove useful in any attempt to reconstruct the prayer in Greek. So much of the language is scriptural that another large class of suggestions will come from the biblical language. Further, we take into account the parts of the prayer which have survived by being incorporated by the compiler of the liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. They are considerable ; and indeed the latter part of the prayer seems to be almost entirely preserved. The state of the case will be seen by referring to the table (p. 23) which exhibits the Latin version of the prayer, together with the corresponding Greek of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. Where this Greek is quotation from the Bible the words are printed in capitals. In the right hand column are references to other biblical passages and to patristic and liturgical parallels. These are sparingly given and only where they illustrate unfamiliar points : otherwise the list might have been so greatly enlarged as to defeat its purpose.

We may next observe the main structure of the prayer. It comprises three main verbs, all expressing some action on the part of the Christian assembly. "We thank Thee" (line 9); "we offer unto Thee" (line 45); "we ask Thee to send Thy Holy Spirit" (line 49). This is very simple. But more than half of the prayer is comprised under the first of these, for the sentence develops by means of a series of relative clauses. These main verbs represent the three great motives of the prayer—*εὐχαριστία*, *προσφορά*, and *ἐπικλήσις*; eucharist, oblation, and invocation.

In the first section the word *εὐχαριστοῦμεν* at once strikes the keynote of all that is to come. Later forms of Canon have lost the word at this point. It survives at this point in the Abyssinian and in the *Testament*, but in the *Apostolic Constitutions* the word is relegated to a later place, and its significance is lost in verbosity. The retrospective significance of the word is also noticeable. It corresponds with the versicle *εὐχαριστήσωμεν*—"let us give thanks." If, as we have supposed, the versicles are of Latin origin, it is more probable that they were fitted on to the *εὐχαριστοῦμεν* of the prayer, already existing there, than that the prayer was fitted on to them by making this link.

In our Canon the Great Thanksgiving plunges at once into the New Testament story of the Incarnation: there is no prior commemoration of the eternal being of God, nor yet of His work in Creation and in the Old Covenant, as revealed in the Old Testament.

Other liturgies have each of the two stages of commemoration, and our prayer is therefore in this respect unusual. Now the "Old Testament" commemoration seems to have been already in use earlier than the date of this document: for Justin narrates how the President first "offers up praise and glory to the Father of all things through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," and then goes on to make at full length the Thanksgiving for these special mercies—as Justin reticently phrases it. The passage is not explicit, and therefore not conclusive; but it illustrates the lack of reference to Natural Religion and the Old Covenant here.

It is this prior commemoration too which leads up to the *Sanctus* with its "Preface," which we have noted as being absent here, though apparently known at an earlier date to Irenæus. The absence of this prior Commemoration or "Preface," with the *Sanctus*, might be explained either as being due merely to curtailment, or else as representing a more primitive stage of development. Of these two alternatives the latter seems more probable, for the following reason.

We have already noted the link between our Canon and the foregoing versicles made by the words *εὐχαριστήσωμεν* and *εὐχαριστοῦμεν*. Now, when we find the Old Testament Commemoration, we find another—a different, but a more familiar link in use at this point. The Preface joins on to the versicles by the link *ἄξιον ὡς ἀληθῶς καὶ δίκαιον*; or *dignum et justum est, vere dignum*, etc.;

or "It is meet and right"—"It is very meet, right," etc.; and the note of thanksgiving expressed by the word *εὐχαριστοῦμεν* is deferred to a later position. In the *Apostolic Constitutions* it is deferred so late that it does not appear until after the commemoration of the whole earthly work of Christ has been made, *i.e.* not only His Incarnation, Ministry, and Betrayal, but also His Crucifixion, Resurrection, Ascension, and Session in Heaven. Only after all this comes the *εὐχαριστοῦμεν*, introducing the recital of the Institution of the Holy Sacrament. This arrangement is of course an unusual one, and it may be only characteristic of the verbosity of the compiler of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. But even where a more normal historical line is preserved, and the account of the Institution is given in its historical position, the same deferring of any further reference to *εὐχαριστία* is found—as for example in the Canon of Serapion.

It seems reasonable to suppose that the *εὐχαριστοῦμεν* link is older than the *ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον* link: and that it has survived here because the Preface and *Sanctus* have not yet been introduced.

For the same reason we miss also here another link which the insertion of the *Sanctus* made necessary and introduced. When that insertion had been made, a further link was needed by which to resume the prayer after the *Sanctus* was over. In the Ethiopic Canon this link is made by resuming the words *pleni sunt celi*, thus—*Vere*

plene sunt celi, etc.; and the same is the case in Serapion's prayer. But it is more common to make the needed link by resuming the word "Holy." Thus we find in the *Apostolic Constitutions* ἅγιος γὰρ εἶ ὡς ἀληθῶς, etc.; and in Latin the same form of link is common in the Gallican rites in the form *Vere sanctus*, etc. Thus the unity of the prayer is restored, and much more satisfactorily than by the clumsy *Te igitur* of the Roman Canon. No such words of course are needed, or are found, here.

Before leaving this first section of the Canon we must again give attention to the phenomenon of the series of relative clauses that describe the work of redemption. This placing of our Lord's earthly work in a subordinate position grammatically is, of course, necessitated by the fact that the whole prayer is addressed to the Eternal Father. The same commemoration as amplified in *Apostolic Constitutions*, seems to pass into a series of independent sentences, for the relative is not repeated as it is here: but in any case the whole work of Christ is essentially commemorated in a series of subordinate and relative clauses. In other words, the recital of the Institution which has come in the West to be regarded as the operative part, was in origin not that, but a portion of narrative. It formed, no doubt, the climax of the New Testament Commemoration, but grammatically it was subordinated to the first of the three main verbs, *viz.* εὐχαριστοῦμεν. Accordingly here it is given in a severely biblical

form without any of the liturgical amplifications, which came in later.

2. With line 44 we come to the second of the main verbs. *Memores igitur . . . offerimus* ; and the action becomes more exclusively sacrificial. The language of our prayer is preserved very faithfully, though in an amplified form in the *Apostolic Constitutions* through all the clauses from 44-55, excepting 53. The phrase *panem . . . et calicem* is found here, which is more explicit than the phrases commonly used at this point. It has been preserved, however, in the corresponding position in the Roman Canon, where it clashes somewhat with the prevailing theory. In 46-49 we have the celebrant's personal note of eucharistic thanksgiving, which is not common in later prayers, apart from the *Apostolic Constitutions*, but is found in the Liturgy of St. Basil.

3. From this we move quickly to the invocation of the Holy Spirit, which is introduced by the third of the main verbs. We note that it has in view, first the oblation of the Church, and secondly the communicants. It is brief and primitive in form ; but surely not ambiguous. The term *oblatio* is the equivalent of *δυσία* in the *Apostolic Constitutions* ; also it is the word applied to the Bread and Wine here, in the rubric immediately preceding the Canon. So it is surely a mistake to maintain that this is not an invocation upon the elements. But it is not specifically consecratory. The development has not yet come about which began to ascribe consecration expressly to the

invocation of the Holy Spirit: nor the tendency to amplify the invocation itself accordingly, by adding some such phrase as we encounter markedly in St. Cyril of Jerusalem—*ἵνα ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα χριστοῦ*, etc.,—and find diffused among the liturgies other than the Roman. This development was not likely to have been made on St. Cyril's own initiative; nor, probably, was it new in his day. Serapion in Egypt and the *Apostolic Constitutions* in Syria are in agreement with him. It must probably have taken place therefore in the end of the Third Century, or the first part of the Fourth.

We are happy in having recovered in this Canon an earlier and more indefinite invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the elements. It can hardly be treated as an interpolation here of later date. It remains on in all the Ethiopic descendants, and becomes amplified there as elsewhere: the same is the case in the *Apostolic Constitutions*. Only in the *Testament* is it lacking: and the *Testament* is the member of the group of derived documents which has departed most from the common original, both by omission and by modification. Moreover the way in which both omission and addition are made in the *Testament* at this point is clumsy in the extreme. The absence of any invocation of the Holy Spirit from the *Testament*, then, carries no confident suggestion that it is in this respect more primitive than the other documents; but that it is less so.

To find an invocation of the Holy Spirit—even

in an undeveloped form—in a document which seems to hail ultimately from Rome in the early part of the Third Century may naturally seem surprising in view of later developments. But in itself it is not surprising. On general grounds it is surely more natural than not, to find a mention of the Holy Spirit in a consecratory prayer, and a mention in the form of an invocation of some sort. It is natural also to find it at this point in the prayer, where it corresponds with the credal order of thought. The *Testament* while extruding the invocation, (lines 50–52) has kept (lines 53–56) the prayer for the gift of the Holy Ghost to the communicants ; but it is more natural that His presence should first be called down upon the *oblatio* lying on the altar, and then only secondly on those who are to receive of the *oblatio*. The idea of food being sanctified by the Word of God and prayer was familiar from 1 Timothy iv. 4, 5 : and to transfer the idea to the sacramental food was natural enough. It would then lead naturally enough to an Invocation of the Λόγος, or of the Holy Spirit, in connection with the Holy Eucharist, such as we encounter in Justin and Irenæus in the former shape, and in the latter shape both here and in the *Didascalia*.¹ So far as date is concerned, there is then nothing surprising.

Nor is there really any surprise so far as place is concerned. Not only was the Invocation of the

¹ Hauler, pp. 81, 85 ; Funk, pp. 370, 376.

Holy Spirit widespread in the Latin West, in Spain, Gaul, Africa, etc., but also there is considerable evidence that the Consecration Prayer at Rome at one time included an invocation of the Holy Spirit ; or, at the least, that Rome knew and recognized such a state of things. Rome therefore is not the single exception to an otherwise universal rule which associated an invocation of the Holy Spirit with the consecration prayer. It is not an exception at all, or at any rate was not so in early days. Gelasius not only speaks of the Holy Spirit as causing the transition of the elements into the divine substance of the Body and Blood of Christ : but also of invoking the heavenly Spirit to come for the consecration of the divine mystery.¹

How, then, are we to account for the subsequent developments ? I venture to suggest that our primitive prayer makes at any rate the main outlines of those developments clear enough, though the details may remain still puzzling : and to put the following before you for your consideration, as a rough sketch of the history of those developments.

We start in an early condition of things, full of ambiguity. It is all one to invoke the Holy Spirit or to invoke the *Λόγος* or *Verbum*. The work of the Holy Spirit is clearly enough seen to justify the first : but the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Word is not clearly enough discerned to differentiate the one from the other.

¹ *D.A.C.L.*, V. 163, s.v. *Épiclèse*.

In the Fourth Century this ambiguity begins to be cleared up : and two opposite tendencies arise in consequence. Where the invocation of the Holy Spirit is the dominant idea, the old and indefinite phrase is amplified (as we have seen), so as to make plain that the purpose of the invocation is to effect the consecration or eucharistic change. This is simple enough, and a well authenticated piece of progress.

But where the invocation of the Word is the dominant idea, the development is less simple. It takes place at first probably in a theological rather than in a liturgical area. The Word, now solely identified with the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, is invoked to act again as He did in the Upper Room : and so give to the faithful His Flesh and Blood. The idea of consecration thus centres round the recital of the Institution. But it is quickly associated not simply with our Lord as the "Word," but with His spoken word : and the expression *verbum* lends itself to this development of a double interpretation.

This stage is well illustrated by the phrase which sums up St. Augustine's teaching, and was so influential on Western thought thenceforward—*Accedit verbum et fit sacramentum*. It is susceptible of either interpretation, or of both ; but in practice the second came to supersede the first.

Thus consecration might be explained in either of two ways—as the result of the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, or of the recital of the Words



of Institution. For a long time the two explanations were not regarded as mutually exclusive, nor was either characteristic of East or West. St. Chrysostom, for example, was quite prepared to give either explanation.

But this situation could hardly be a lasting one. When Rome had definitely espoused the verbal view, it was obliged to deal with the invocation of the Holy Spirit, still presumably surviving in its liturgy. We can apparently trace two methods which were tried to obviate the anomaly of a consecratory invocation of the Holy Spirit after the consecration was held to be completed. There are two sections in the Roman Canon which have been thought to be the equivalents of such an invocation or to retain traces of it. One is the *Supplices te rogamus* clause which is found after the oblation, that is in the old position of this invocation ; but it now asks that the offerings may be borne up to the heavenly altar by the hands of God's holy angel. This is certainly some sort of equivalent for the older invocation ; and it may be a transformed relic of it. In that case the invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the oblation was banished here, as it was in the case of the *Testament*.

The other clause in question is the *Quam oblationem*, which precedes the recital of the Institution. It still contains a prayer that the oblation may "become to us the Body and Blood of Christ" ; that is to say, it uses the language of an Invocation of the Holy Spirit in its devel-

oped form, but without mention of the Holy Spirit. It seems likely, therefore, that a second method of dealing with the difficulty was to transfer the old Invocation from its natural and historical position, subsequent to the commemoration of the redemptive work of our Lord, to this earlier position, where it would not clash with the accepted view of the consecration. The likelihood of this is strengthened by the newly-discovered Deir-Balizeh papyrus, which has a developed Invocation of this sort in this position. The experiment seems then to have been common to Alexandria and Rome.

But apparently at neither place was it found satisfactory. The dislocation involved was too great to be tolerable. It was like introducing Pentecost into the middle of Holy Week. Alexandria reverted to the usual Eastern model ; and Rome again substituted generalities for the invocation.

Thus doctrinal consistency was secured : but at the cost of making a break with Christian tradition, and of having a Canon which, apart from doxologies, is devoid of any specific mention of the Holy Spirit.

LATIN VERSION, FROM
HAULER

APOSTOLIC
CONSTITUTIONS

1. <i>Illi vero offerant diacones oblationem, quique imponens manus in eam cum omni presbyterio dicat gratias agens</i>		
2. <i>DOMINUS vobiscum.</i>		
3. <i>et omnes dicant Et cum Spiritu tuo.</i>	Καὶ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος σοῦ	
4. <i>Susum corda ;</i>	ἄνω	<i>Ap. Const. ἄνω τὸν νοῦν.</i>
5. <i>Habemus ad dominam.</i>	ἔχομεν πρὸς τὴν κύριον.	
6. <i>GRATIAS agamus dom- ino ;</i>	εὐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ κυ- ρίῳ.	
7. <i>Dignum et iustum est.</i>	ἔξιον καὶ δίκαιον.	
8. <i>Et sic iam prosequatur,</i>		
9. <i>GRATIAS tibi referimus, deus,</i>	εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, Θεέ,	<i>Apoc. xi. 17.</i>
10. <i>per dilectum puerum tuum Jesum Christum</i>	ἀγαπητὸς γιὸς	<i>Mt. iii. 13.</i>
11. <i>QUEM in ultimis tem- poribus</i>		<i>Heb. i. 1. Irenæus, Hæres. III. xviii. 1 &c.; Hipp., Contra N. c. 17.</i>
12. <i>Misisti nobis salvatorem et redemptorem</i>		<i>Acts vii. 35.</i>
13. <i>et angelum voluntatis tuæ ;</i>	ἄγγελον τῆς βουλῆς σου	<i>Is. ix. 6.</i>
14. <i>Qui est verbum tuum inseparabile(m),</i>		<i>ἀχώριστος Justin, Dial. 128. ii. Hipp., Contra N. 18.</i>
15. <i>per quem omnia fecisti,</i>	δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα πεποιήκας	<i>Jo. i. 3, &c.</i>
16. <i>et bene placitum tibi fuit ;—</i>		<i>Mt. iii. 17.</i>
17. <i>misisti de caelo in matricem virginis</i>	ἐν μήτρᾳ παρθένου	

LATIN VERSION, FROM HAULER	APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS	
18. Quique in utero habitus 19. incarnatus est, 20. et filius tibi ostensus est,	ἐσαρκώθη	<i>Lu.</i> ii. 21. <i>Jo.</i> i. 14. <i>Hipp. Contra N.</i> 4, ἐκ πνεύματος πα- ρθένου υἱὸς θεοῦ ἀποδοδειγμένος. <i>Cp. L.E.W.</i> 51, James.
21. ex spiritu sancto et virgine natus ;	γενόμενος ἐκ παρθένου τὸ θελημά σου ἐπλήρ- ωσε	
22. Qui voluntatem tuam complens,		
23. et populum sanctum tibi acquirens,		<i>1 Pet.</i> ii. 9. <i>L.E.W.</i> 326 Basil.
24. extendit manus, cum pateretur,		
25. ut a passione liberaret eos	ἵνα πάθους λύση καὶ θανάτου ἐξέλῃται τούτους	<i>Is.</i> lxxv. 2.
26. qui in te crediderunt :		
27. Qui cumque traderetur uoluntariæ passioni,	ἐν ἡ γὰρ νηκτὶ παρεδί- δοτο	ἐκούσιος, <i>L.E.W.</i> 51, 327.
28. ut mortem soluat,		<i>2 Tim.</i> i. 10 ; <i>Acts</i> ii. 24. <i>Barn.</i> v. 6.
29. et vincula diaboli dir- umpat,	ἵνα ῥήξῃ τὰ δεσμὰ τοῦ διαβόλου	
30. et infernum calcet,		<i>L.E.W.</i> 327 Basil.
31. et iustos illuminet,		
32. et terminum figat,		
33. et resurrectionem mani- festet,		<i>Barnabas</i> , v. 6.
34. accipiens, panem,	λαβὼν ἄρτον εἰπὼν	
35. gratias tibi agens, dixit ;--		<i>Lu.</i> xxii. 19 ; <i>1 Cor.</i> xi. 23.
36. Accipite, manducate,	λάβετε φάγετε	
37. Hoc est corpus meum	τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου	

LATIN VERSION, FROM
HAULER

APOSTOLIC
CONSTITUTIONS

38. quod pro vobis con-
fringetur :
39. Similiter et calicem,
dicens ;—
40. Hic est sanguis meus
41. qui pro vobis effunditur
42. quando hoc facitis,
43. meam commemoration-
em facitis.
44. Memores igitur mortis
et resurrectionis Eius,
45. Offerimus tibi panem
et calicem,
46. gratias tibi agentes,
47. quia nos dignos habu-
isti
48. adstare coram te et tibi
ministrare.
49. Et petimus
50. ut mittas spiritum tuum
sanctum
51. in oblationem sanctae
ecclesiae ;
52. in unum congregans des
omnibus
53. qui percipiunt sanctis
54. in repletionem spiritus
sancti,
55. ad confirmationem fidei
in veritate,

τὸ θρῦπτόμενον
ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον
... λέγων
τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμά μου
τὸ περὶ ἱμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον
τοῦτο ποιεῖτε

εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν
Μεμνημένοι τοίνυν
τοῦ . . . θανάτου
καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως,
προσφέρομεν σοι . . .
τὸν ἄρτον . . . καὶ
τὸ ποτήριον,

εὐχαριστοῦντες σοι
ἐφ' οἷς κατηξίωσας
ἡμᾶς
ἐστάναι ἐνώπιόν σου
καὶ ἱερατεῦν σοι
καὶ ἀξιουμέν σε,
ὅπως . . . καταπέμψῃς
τὸ ἅγιόν σου πνεῦμα
ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταύ-
την . . .

ἵνα οἱ μεταλαβόντες
αὐτοῦ . . .
πνεύματος ἁγίου πλη-
ρωθῶσιν.

L.E.W. 329 Basil.

Didache, 9.

Deir-Balizeh papy-
rus εἰς βεβαίω-
σιν καὶ προσθή-
κην πίστεως, in
D. A. C. L. II.
1885, s.v. Canon.

LATIN VERSION, FROM HAULER	APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS	
56. ut te laudemus et glori- ficemus ;		
57. per puerum tuum Iesum Christum,		Hipp., <i>Contra N.</i> 18. Αὐτῷ (χριστῷ) ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ᾧμα πατρὶ καὶ ἀγίῳ πνεύματι,
58. per quem tibi gloria et honor,	σοι . . . δόξα . . . τιμὴ τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ υἱῷ καὶ τῷ ἀγίῳ πνεύ- ματι	
59. patri et filio cum sancto spiritu,		
60. in sancta ecclesia tua,		ἐν τῇ ἀγίᾳ ἐκκλη- σίᾳ,
61. et nunc et in saecula saeculorum. Amen.	καὶ νῦν, καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων . . . Ἀμήν.	καὶ νῦν, καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώ- νων. Ἀμήν.

THE ALCUIN CLUB

Founded with the object of promoting the study of the History
and Use of the Book of Common Prayer.

President

THE RIGHT REV. CHARLES GORE, D.D.

Committee

ATHELSTAN RILEY, Esq., Sr., M.A., *Chairman.*

- | | |
|--|---|
| E. G. CUTHBERT F. ATCHLEY,
Esq., L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S. | *STEPHEN GASELEE, Esq., M.A.,
C.B.E. |
| The Ven. E. M. BLACKIE, M.A. | HAROLD C. KING, Esq., M.A. |
| * The Rev. F. E. BRIGHTMAN,
D.D., D.Phil. Louvain. | VIVIAN H. KING, Esq.,
A.R.I.B.A. [M.A. |
| SIR CYRIL S. COBB, M.A.,
K.B.E., M.V.O. | The Rev. Canon T. A. LACEY, |
| The Rev. PERCY DEARMER,
D.D. | The Rev. J. N. NEWLAND-
SMITH, M.A. |
| * The Rev. A. S. DUNCAN-
JONES, M.A. | * The Ven. J. H. SRAWLEY, D.D. |
| F. C. EELES, Esq., F.R.Hist.S.,
F.S.A.Scot. | * The Rev. Canon R. M.
WOOLLEY, D.D. |
| * The Rev. W. H. FRERE, D.D. | The Rev. Canon CHR. WORDS-
WORTH, M.A. |
| | * E. G. P. WYATT, Esq., M.A. |

* Publications Sub-Committee.

Hon. Secretary

The Rev. A. S. DUNCAN-JONES, M.A.,
S. Mary's Vicarage, Primrose Hill, London, N.W. 3.

Hon. Treasurer

VIVIAN H. KING, Esq., A.R.I.B.A.

Hon. Auditor

REV. H. A. E. STANDFAST, M.A.

Assistant Secretary

MISS WARD

Office : 46 Stanley Gardens, South Hampstead, London, N.W. 3.
Tel. No. 633 Hampstead.

Bankers

BARCLAY'S BANK, 55 England Lane, London, N.W. 3.

THE ALCUIN CLUB exists in order to encourage and assist in the practical study of ceremonial, and the arrangement of Churches, their furniture and ornaments, in accordance with the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, strict obedience to which is the guiding principle of the work of the Club.

The Club shall consist of Members and Associates, to be elected by the Committee.

The Subscription for *Members* shall be 20s. per annum, entitling them to all publications *gratis*; and for *Associates* 2s. 6d. per annum, entitling them to such of the Tracts *gratis*, and such reductions on other publications as the Committee may determine. There shall be no Entrance Fee, nor Composition for Subscriptions.

Applications for election should be sent to the Assistant Secretary, Miss Ward, 46 Stanley Gardens, South Hampstead, London, N.W. 3, as well as all Subscriptions.

The Annual Report and List of Members, as well as the List of Publications, can be obtained from the Assistant Secretary.

LANTERN SLIDES.—A varied selection of slides for lectures can be hired from the Club. Further particulars on application to Vivian H. King, Esq., 13 Eton Road, London, N.W. 3.

PUBLICATIONS

COLLECTIONS

- I. **English Altars.** A large folio volume with 14 pp. of Collotypes. Explanatory Notes by Sir W. H. St. JOHN HOPE, Litt.D., D.C.L. [Out of print.]
- II. **Exposition de la Messe.** A large folio volume containing a Treatise on the Mass from a French version of the Legenda Aurea of Jacobus de Voragine, now in the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge, and 22 plates from Illustrations in this MS. Together with four Tracts from "The Lay Folks' Mass Book," "Merita Missæ," etc. Edited by the Rev. WALTER HOWARD FRERE, D.D. Price £1. 10s.
- III and IV. **Pontifical Services**, vols. i and ii. Two large folio volumes containing Descriptive Notes and a Liturgical Introduction by the Rev. WALTER HOWARD FRERE, D.D., and 20 plates of 62 Illustrations from Miniatures of the XVth and XVIth centuries. Price £1. 10s. each.
- V. **Dat Boexken vander Missen.** (The Booklet of the Mass.) By GHERIT VANDER GOUDE, 1507. 34 woodcuts illustrating the Celebration of the Holy Communion, described, and the explanatory text of the Flemish original translated, with illustrative excerpts from contemporary missals and tracts by the Rev. PERCY DEARMER, D.D. Price £1. 1s.
- VI. **The Edwardian Inventories for Bedfordshire.** Edited by F. C. EELES, F.R.Hist.S., F.S.A.Scot., from transcripts by the Rev. J. E. BROWN, B.A. Price 5s.
- VII. **The Edwardian Inventories for Huntingdonshire.** Edited by Mrs. S. C. LOMAS, editor of "State Papers Charles I Addenda," etc., from transcripts by T. CRAIB. Price 10s.

- VIII. **Pontifical Services**, vol. iii. Descriptive notes and 143 Illustrations from woodcuts in pontificals of the XVth century. Edited by F. C. EELES, F.R.Hist.S., F.S.A.Scot. Price £1. 1s.
- IX. **The Edwardian Inventories for Buckinghamshire.** Edited by F. C. EELES, F.R.Hist.S., F.S.A.Scot., from transcripts by the Rev. J. E. BROWN, B.A. Price £1. 1s. [Out of print.]
- X. **Fifty Pictures of Gothic Altars.** Descriptive Notes and 50 Illustrations. Edited by the Rev. PERCY DEARMER, D.D. Price £1. 1s. [Out of print.]
- XI. **The Sarum Missal in English.** Two volumes, containing a translation of the complete Sarum Missal by the Rev. F. E. WARREN, B.D., F.S.A. Price £1. 2s. 6d. [Out of print.]
- XII. **Pontifical Services**, vol. iv. Descriptive Notes and 134 Illustrations from woodcuts in pontificals of the XVth century. Edited by ATHELSTAN RILEY, M.A. Price £1. 1s. [Out of print.]
- XIII. **A History of the Use of Incense in Divine Worship.** xx + 404 pp. 60 Illustrations. By E. G. CUTHBERT F. ATCHLEY, L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S. Price £3.
- XIV. **Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation**, vol. i. An Introduction on the theory, history, and practice of Episcopal and other Visitations. By the Rev. WALTER HOWARD FRERE, D.D. Price £1. [Out of print.]
- XV. **The Same**, vol. ii (1536-58). Edited by the Rev. W. H. FRERE, D.D., with the assistance of W. M. KENNEDY, M.A. Price 30s. [Out of print.]
- XVI. **The Same**, vol. iii (1558-75). Edited by the Rev. W. H. FRERE, D.D. Price 30s. [Out of print.]
- XVII. **Traditional Ceremonial and Customs connected with the Scottish Liturgy.** By F. C. EELES, F.R.Hist.S., F.S.A.Scot. Price £1.

- XVIII. **The Rationale of Ceremonial, 1540-1543**, with Notes and Appendices and an Essay on the Regulation of Ceremonial during the reign of King Henry VIII. By Sir C. S. COBB, M.A., K.B.E., B.C.L. Price 10s.
- XIX. **Illustrations of the Liturgy.** Thirteen drawings of the Celebration of the Holy Communion in a parish church. By CLEMENT O. SKILBECK. With Notes descriptive and explanatory, an Introduction on "The Present Opportunity," and a Preface on the English and American Uses. By Rev. PERCY DEARMER, D.D. Price 4s. 6d.
- XX. **The Edwardian Inventories for the City and County of Exeter.** Edited by Miss B. CRESSWELL, from transcripts of the original documents in the Guildhall, Exeter. Price 10s.
- XXI. **The Sacrament Reserved ; being a History of the Practice of Reserving the Eucharist up to the IVth Lateran Council.** By the Rev. W. H. FREESTONE. Price £1.
- XXII. **The Ornaments of the Ministers as shown on English Monumental Brasses.** Illustrated. By the Rev. H. J. CLAYTON, A.K.C. Price £1. 5s.
- XXIII. **The Chantry Certificates for Oxfordshire.** Edited and transcribed by ROSE GRAHAM, F.R.Hist.S., formerly of Somerville College, Oxford, and **The Edwardian Inventories of Church Goods for Oxfordshire.** Edited by ROSE GRAHAM from transcripts by T. CRAIB, of H.M. Public Record Office. Price 10s. 6d.
- XXIV. **Illustrations of the Occasional Offices of the Church.** Taken from Mediaeval pictures and miniatures. Edited by H. S. KINGSFORD, M.A. Price £1. 5s.

TRACTS

- I. **Ornaments of the Rubric.** (Third Edition.) By J. T. MICKLETHWAITE, F.S.A. Price 5s.
- II. **Consolidation.** (Second Edition.) By the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of S. Paul's. Price 1s. [*Out of print.*]
- III. **Liturgical Interpolations.** (Second Edition.) By the Rev. Canon T. A. LACEY, M.A. [*Out of print.*]
- IV. **The Parish Clerk and his right to read the Liturgical Epistle.** By E. G. CUTHBERT F. ATCHLEY, L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S. [*Out of print.*]
- V. **A First English Ordo: A Celebration of the Lord's Supper with one Minister, described and discussed by some members of the Alcuin Club.** Price 2s., in stiff paper covers.
- VI. **The People's Prayers: Being some considerations on the use of the Litany in Public Worship.** By E. G. CUTHBERT F. ATCHLEY, L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S. Price 1s. 6d.; or 6d. in paper covers.
- VII. **The Sign of the Cross in the Western Liturgies.** By the Rev. E. E. BERESFORD COOKE. Price 1s. 6d. [*Out of print.*]
- VIII. **The "Interpretations" of the Bishops and their Influence on Elizabethan Policy.** By W. M. KENNEDY, M.A. Price 1s. 6d.
- IX. **Prayer Book Revision: The "Irreducible Minimum."** Edited by ATHELSTAN RILEY, M.A. Price 2s. net.
- X. **The Bread of the Eucharist.** By the Rev. R. MAXWELL WOOLLEY, D.D. With 11 Illustrations. Price 4s. 6d. net.
- XI. **English or Roman Use?** By E. G. P. WYATT, M.A. Price 1s. net; cheap edition, 3d. net.

- XII. **Russian Observations upon the American Prayer Book.** Translated by WILFRID J. BARNES, and Edited with Notes by the Rev. WALTER HOWARD FRERE, D.D. Price 2s. 6d.
- XIII. **A Directory of Ceremonial.** With Six Illustrations by CLEMENT O. SKILBECK. Price, 2s. 6d.

PRAYER BOOK REVISION PAMPHLETS

- I. **Liturgical Interpolations and Prayer Book Revision.** By the Rev. Canon T. A. LACEY, M.A. Price 1s., or in paper covers, 6d.
- II. **The Liturgical Gospels.** By the Rev. W. H. FRERE, D.D. Price in paper covers, 1s.
- III. **A Century of Collects.** Selected and translated by the Rev. ATWELL M. Y. BAYLAY. Price 1s. 6d.
[*Out of print.*]
- IV. **The Manual Acts.** By the Rev. VERNON STALEY. Price 1s.; or in paper covers, 6d. [*Out of print.*]
- V. **The Eucharistic Prayer.** By E. G. P. WYATT, M.A. Price 1s. 6d.
- VI. **Memorial Services.** Extracted by permission from "A Prayer Book Revised," as issued in 1913 with a Preface by the Right Rev. BISHOP C. GORE. Price 1s.
- VII. **The Burial Service.** By E. G. P. WYATT, M.A. Price, 2s.
- VIII. **The Primitive Consecration Prayer.** A Lecture given at the Annual Meeting of the Club, June 7, 1922, by W. H. FRERE, D.D., Priest of the Community of the Resurrection. Price 1s. 6d.

REDUCED PRICES.—Members can still obtain, through the Assistant Secretary, some of the earlier publications at a reduction.

For all information apply to Miss Ward, 46 Stanley Gardens, South Hampstead, London, N.W. 3.

PUBLISHERS.—Messrs. A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 28 Margaret Street, London, W. 1, and 9 High Street, Oxford.

Printed in England by A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., London and Oxford

PRINTED IN ENGLAND BY
A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LTD., LONDON AND OXFORD

FRERE, W.H.

The Primitive consecration
prayer.

BOT
4/16/3
of 7.

